

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #1184/01 3521816
ZNY SSSSS ZZH
O 181816Z DEC 09
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0761
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/VCJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/Joint STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHEHNSC/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 5831
RHMFIS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFIS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUESDT/DTRA-OSES DARMSTADT GE IMMEDIATE
RUENAAA/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFIS/DIRSSP WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
INFO RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA PRIORITY 3010
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV PRIORITY 2020
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 7227

S E C R E T GENEVA 001184

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24
CIA FOR WINPAC
JCS FOR J5/DDGSA
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR
NSC FOR LOOK
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 12/17/2019

TAGS: KACT MARR PARM PREL RS US START

SUBJECT: START FOLLOW-ON NEGOTIATIONS, GENEVA
(SFO-GVA-VII): (U) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WORKING GROUP MEETING, DECEMBER 11, 2009

Classified By: A/S Rose E. Gottemoeller, United States START Negotiator. Reasons: 1.4(b) and (d).

¶1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VII-125.

¶2. (U) Meeting Date: December 11, 2009
Time: 10:00 A.M. - 11:20 A.M.
Place: Russian Mission, Geneva

SUMMARY

¶3. (S) The Memorandum of Understanding Working Group (MOUWG) chairs, Mr. Trout and Gen Orlov, met at the Russian Mission on December 11. Orlov discussed the new general provisions section, which was mostly agreed to, while Trout took the opportunity to discuss issues relating to data exchange. The upcoming Presidential telephone call was also brought up, with Orlov commenting that the central limits would be a main topic but the heavy bomber counting attribution number would not. Trout also addressed the Russian proposal to merge space launch facilities with test ranges. End Summary.

¶4. (U) SUBJECT SUMMARY: Presidential Phone Call; General Provisions Look Good, Except for the Data Exchange; START Annex J; Bracketed Text and Other Issues; and Closing Comments.

PRESIDENTIAL PHONE CALL

15. (S) Orlov began the meeting by briefly commenting on the upcoming Presidential telephone call scheduled for Friday, December 12 or Saturday, December 13. He stated that there were some large issues to be decided, such as the central numerical limits and the third deployed and non-deployed launcher limit. Trout, referring to the 1500 total warheads, one heavy bomber warhead attribution proposal with 1600 total warheads, and three heavy bomber warhead attribution proposal, specifically asked whether this was going to be a topic for the telephone call. Orlov replied that the limits would but not exact numerical heavy bomber attribution proposals, arguing that this was for the delegations to decide with appropriate guidance from their capitals.

GENERAL PROVISIONS LOOK GOOD,
EXCEPT FOR THE DATA EXCHANGE

16. (S) Orlov turned to Section I, General Provisions, and discussed some issues with the recent document. After resolving some translation issues, Orlov turned to the paragraph stating the requirement to exchange data that was current as of signature, 45 days after the treaty was signed, noting that this paragraph was bracketed as the Russians did not want to exchange data at this time. He clarified, however, that Ryzhkov was flying to Geneva over the weekend and that a better explanation of this position could be provided with Ryzhkov present. Orlov also restated the Russian position regarding the data to be exchanged at

signature, saying that only the aggregate numbers would be provided. The rest of the document would just be categories. Trout reiterated the U.S. position of using July 2009 data to populate the database at signature. Orlov commented that this data had already been exchanged back in July so why would we want to exchange it again. After a few more clarifications by both Trout and Orlov, Orlov again stated that Ryzhkov would have more to offer regarding this subject.

17. (S) Pischulov brought up the subject of fixed test launchers with respect to providing coordinates, arguing that the use of the term "fixed" was not consistent with the rest of the database. After some discussion, and an argument that the SLBM section used the term test launchers, it was agreed to delete the word "fixed," with both sides agreeing that this clause did not apply to mobile test launchers.

18. (S) Pischulov addressed some other minor details in the document with LT Lobner, all of which, after some discussion, were agreed.

START ANNEX J

19. (S) Orlov moved on to the former START Annex J, asking which group would be responsible for completing this document. Trout pointed out that Dr. Warner and Col Ilin had discussed working on this document in the Inspection Protocol Working Group (IPWG). Trout pointed out, however, that the IPWG was very busy and that perhaps it would be better if the MOUWG worked on this document. Lobner added that some of the paragraphs from this Annex had already been moved into different sections by the IPWG, as well as into the general provisions section of the database. Orlov concluded saying that the document needed one owner and that he would talk to Ilin, suggesting Trout talk to Warner to settle this issue. Trout agreed.

BRACKETED TEXT AND OTHER ISSUES

10. (S) Trout turned to Section IX, Other Data Required by

the Treaty, and agreed to delete the last two remaining paragraphs exclusive for mobile missiles. Lobner and Pischulov briefly discussed "version" versus "variant," with Lobner arguing that although references to support equipment and fixed structures had been deleted in some cases, references to mobile launchers had not. Consequently, the technical term to refer to differences for these launchers was "version" and not "variant."

¶11. (S) Trout asked about the Russian position on space launch facilities and test ranges, and it was confirmed that the Russian position had not changed. Trout firmly stated that the United States rejected the Russian proposal to merge these facilities into one type.

¶12. (S) Regarding conforming, Trout discussed the possibility of sending Section VII, ICBM and SLBM Technical Data, to the Conforming Group. Orlov agreed that this was a

possibility and that he would review the text to see whether the section could be sent.

¶13. (S) Trout referred to the recent Russian document that did not list the RS-24 as an existing type. Orlov clarified by stating this was an error; the RS-24 would be declared as an existing type.

CLOSING COMMENTS

¶14. (S) Orlov wrapped up the meeting asking Trout's opinion on two items. First, he asked whether some of the larger issues could be decided in the next few days and could the MOUWG finish the document in 2-3 days. Trout said that he believed it was possible. Second, Orlov asked about travel plans, referencing a return to Geneva in January. Trout stated that he believed the delegation would re-assemble sometime during the week of January 11. Orlov and Trout agreed that another scheduled meeting was not necessary at this time but as soon as guidance changed on either side they would set up a meeting.

¶15. (U) Documents provided: None.

¶16. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES

Mr. Trout
LT Lobner
Mr. French (Int)

RUSSIA

Gen Orlov
Col Pischulov
Ms. Evarovskaya (Int)

¶17. (U) Gottemoeller sends.

GRIFFITHS